UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/828,395 | 04/06/2001 | Michael Davis | 110-070 | 5153 |

7590 11/18/2004

Anthony R. Barkume
Greenberg Traurig LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| POPHAM, JEFFREY D | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2137 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/828,395 | DAVIS ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Jeffrey D. Popham | 2137 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 April 2001 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07302001, 10152002.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

***Remarks***

Claims 1-22 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Renner et al. (U.S. 5,679,945).

Regarding Claim 1,

An access control security system comprising:

A plurality of access control groups (Column 10, lines 26-30), each access control group interconnected to the control panel on an independent multi-wire data bus (Column 6, lines 11-16), each access control group comprising:

An access interface unit comprising (Column 2, lines 32-40):

Data output means for transmitting data onto the data bus to the control panel (Column 6, lines 37-48),

Data input means for receiving data via the data bus from the control panel (Column 6, lines 48-52),

Processing means (Column 4, lines 33-37), interoperating with the data output means and the data input means, for operating data transfers over the data bus, the processing means adapted to generate a data message for transmission onto the data bus via the data output means (Column 6, lines 34-43), the data message comprising a Wiegand message field in accordance with the Wiegand protocol and an extended data field (Fig. 5 and Column 10, lines 36-40). In Fig. 5 of Renner et al., the Wiegand-based security system sends a message C to either ICR1 or ICR2; in order to send this message, it must have obtained the address of the ICR from the message the ICR sent to the system.

Regarding Claim 3,

The system of claim 1 wherein the access interface unit further comprises user ID reading means for reading an ID device (Column 4, lines 32-33).

Regarding Claim 4,

The system of claim 3 wherein the ID reading means is configured to read an access control card (Column 4, lines 40-43).

Regarding Claim 8,

The system of claim 3 wherein the processing means interoperates with the ID reading means, and wherein the extended data field further comprises an information field indicative of a property of an ID read by the ID reading means (Fig. 5 and Column 10, lines 36-40).

Regarding Claim 9,

The system of claim 1 wherein at least one access control group comprises a plurality of access interface units, and wherein the extended data field comprises address information uniquely identifying each access interface unit in an access control group (Fig. 5 and Column 10, lines 36-40).

Regarding Claim 21,

The system of claim 1 wherein data transfers are made to the control panel using the electrical and information content of the Wiegand protocol via the Data "0" (W0) and Data "1" (W1) output signals (Column 6, lines 34-52).

Regarding Claim 22,

The system of claim 1 wherein data transfers are made by the control panel using the electrical characteristics of the Wiegand protocol via the LEDCTL (C)input signal as a serial protocol (Column 6, lines 34-52).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2, 15, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renner et al. (U.S. 5,679,945) in view of Vos (U.S. 4,849,927).

Regarding Claim 2,

Renner et al. fail to disclose that the extended data field comprises a status information field indicative of a status condition of the access interface unit.

Vos, however, discloses this fact that the extended data field contains status information about the access interface unit (Column 3, lines 42-65). This new system would be the system of Renner et al. with the wire meshes of Vos on the inside of the exterior panels of the access interface unit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use such a scheme for obtaining external status data in order to make the system more secure. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to protect the access interface unit against unauthorized tampering.

Regarding Claim 15,

Renner et al. fail to disclose that the access interface unit comprises external status input means for accepting external status data from an external device coupled thereto, and that the status information field of the extended data field comprises the external status data.

Vos, however, discloses this means for obtaining external status data (Column 3, lines 42-65). This new system would be the system of Renner et al. with the wire meshes of Vos on the inside of the exterior panels of the access interface unit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use such a scheme for obtaining external status data in order to make the system more secure. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to protect the access interface unit against unauthorized tampering.

Regarding Claim 16,

Renner et al. fail to disclose that the external device is adapted to measure temperature and that the external status data comprises the measured temperature.

Vos, however, discloses this adaptation for detecting temperature (Column 4, lines 40-56). This new system would be the system of Renner et al. with the addition of the temperature detector of Vos inside the access interface unit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use such a scheme to obtain temperature data in order to make the system more secure. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to prevent attempts at

freezing the hardware within the access interface unit in an effort to make the system malfunction.

Regarding Claim 18,

Renner et al. fail to disclose that the external device is adapted to detect physical tampering with the access interface unit and that the external status data comprises a tamper indication.

Vos, however, discloses this adaptation for detecting physical tampering (Column 3, lines 42-65). This new system would be the system of Renner et al. with the wire meshes of Vos on the inside of the exterior panels of the access interface unit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use such a scheme for obtaining physical tampering data in order to make the system more secure. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to protect the access interface unit against unauthorized tampering.

4. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renner et al. (U.S. 5,679,945) in view of Sanderson (U.S. 5,467,082).

Regarding Claim 5,

Renner et al. fail to disclose the fact that the ID reading means is configured to read a data transponder.

Sanderson, however, discloses the use of ID reading means configured to read a data transponder (Column 1, lines 24-31). This new system would be the system of Renner et al. with the access control interface reading a transponder, such as in Sanderson's system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to configure the ID reading means of Renner et al. to read the data transponder of Sanderson so as to allow easier access to the user. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to allow identification without the necessity of physical contact between the access control interface and the transponder.

Regarding Claim 6,

Renner et al. fail to disclose the fact that the ID reading means is configured to read a data-carrying key fob.

Sanderson, however, discloses the use of ID reading means configured to read a data-carrying key fob (Column 4, lines 22-27). This new system would be the system of Renner et al. with the access control interface reading a data-carrying key fob, such as in Sanderson's system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to configure the ID reading means of Renner et al. to read the data-carrying key fob of Sanderson so as to allow easier access to the user. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do so in order to allow identification without the necessity of physical contact between the access control interface and the data-carrying key fob (Column 1, lines 24-31).

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renner et al. (U.S. 5,679,945) in view of Scott et al. (U.S. 6,272,562).

Renner et al. fail to disclose the fact that the ID reading means is configured to read biometric data from a user.

Scott et al., however, disclose this fact that the ID reading means is configured to read biometric data from a user (Fig. 1 and Column 3, lines 32-36). This would form the system of Renner et al. with a fingerprint reader (such as 108 in Scott et al.'s Fig. 1) within it.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use a fingerprint scanner in Renner et al.'s system so as to authenticate users biometrically. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use a fingerprint scanner in Renner et al.'s system in order to limit access to selected individuals using fingerprint biometrics, which are largely regarded as an accurate method of biometric identification and verification (Column 1, lines 9-20).

6. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renner et al. (U.S. 5,679,945) in view of Wobber et al. (U.S. 5,235,642).

Regarding Claim 10,

Renner et al. fail to disclose the fact that the processing means is further adapted to utilize an error detection algorithm as a function of data contained within the extended data field.

Wobber et al., however, disclose the use of an error detection algorithm (Column 4, lines 55-65). This new system would be the system of Renner et al. applying the error detection algorithm from Wobber et al. to the message before sending it to the control panel.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to add the error detection scheme of Wobber et al. to the access security system of Renner et al. to make the system secure from tampering. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to detect corrupted packets and to detect messages that may have been tampered with in an attempt to break the system's security provisions.

Regarding Claim 11,

Renner et al. fail to disclose the fact that the error detection algorithm is a cyclic redundancy check (CRC), and wherein the extended data field is appended with the CRC.

Wobber et al., however, disclose the use of CRC as the error detection algorithm (Column 4, lines 55-65). This new system would be

the system of Renner et al. applying the CRC error detection from Wobber et al. to the message before sending it to the control panel.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to add the error detection scheme of Wobber et al. to the access security system of Renner et al. to make the system secure from tampering. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to detect corrupted packets and to detect messages that may have been tampered with in an attempt to break the system's security provisions.

7. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renner et al. (U.S. 5,679,945) in view of Vos (U.S. 4,849,927) and in further view of Puchek et al. (U.S. 6,496,595).

Regarding Claim 12,

The system of Renner et al. and Vos fails to disclose that the access interface unit further comprises user input means for accepting user input functions, and wherein the status condition of the access interface unit indicates a function input by a user via the user input means.

Puchek et al., however, disclose this method of providing user input means and using the status condition of the access interface unit to indicate a function input by a user via those means (Column 10, lines 28-36). This new system would be the system of Renner et al. and Vos with

the button from Puchek et al. on the front that the user can press when needed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to provide user input means and using the status condition of the access interface unit to indicate a function input by a user via those means in order to provide for a way of communication for the unauthorized person to communicate that they need attention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to communicate with security personnel or other appropriate personnel, such as a receptionist (Column 10, lines 28-36).

Regarding Claim 13,

The system of Renner et al. and Vos fail to disclose that the input means comprises at least one pushbutton.

Puchek et al., however, disclose this addition of a pushbutton to the access control interface (Column 10, lines 28-36). This new system would be the system of Renner et al. and Vos with the pushbutton from Puchek et al. added to the access control interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to add a pushbutton to the access control interface in order to provide for a way of communication for the unauthorized person to communicate that they need attention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to

communicate with security personnel or other appropriate personnel, such as a receptionist (Column 10, lines 28-36).

Regarding Claim 14,

The system of Renner et al. and Vos fails to disclose that the function of the pushbutton is a door bell function.

Puchek et al., however, disclose the fact that the function of the pushbutton is a door bell function (Column 10, lines 28-36). This new system would be the system of Renner et al. and Vos with the pushbutton being used as a door bell, as in Puchek et al., added to the access control interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use this pushbutton as a door bell in order to provide for a way of communication for the unauthorized person to communicate that they need attention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to communicate with security personnel or other appropriate personnel, such as a receptionist (Column 10, lines 28-36).

8. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renner et al. (U.S. 5,679,945) in view of Green (U.S. 5,954,583).

The system of Renner et al. and Vos fails to disclose that the external device is adapted to detect a change in light incident and that the external status data comprises data indicative of a change in light.

Green, however, discloses a method of detecting the lighting conditions (Column 7, lines 38-57). This new system would be the system of Renner et al. and Vos with a light detector, lighting method, and camera.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to add a light detector to the system of Renner et al. and Vos in order to provide more security. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to ensure that the person was actually standing there, as opposed to a picture being held up to the camera.

9. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renner et al. (U.S. 5,679,945) in view of Vos (U.S. 4,849,927) and in further view of Rakoff (U.S. 5,886,894).

The system of Renner et al. and Vos fails to disclose that the processing means is further adapted to generate supervision data on a periodic basis and that the status information field comprises the supervision data.

Rakoff, however, discloses this adaptation for generating supervision data (Column 6, lines 8-16). This new system would be the system of Renner et al. and Vos generating and sending supervision data to the control panel on a periodic basis, as in Rakoff.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to adapt the system for the sending of periodic supervision data in order to check for tampering periodically. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to retrieve any information about tampering and security breaches every second.

10. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renner et al. (U.S. 5,679,945) in view of Vos (U.S. 4,849,927) and in further view of Beigel et al. (U.S. 6,249,212).

The system of Renner et al. and Vos fails to disclose that the processing means is adapted to detect a malfunction of the access interface unit and that the status information field comprises data indicative of a malfunction.

Beigel et al., however, disclose this detection of a malfunction in the access interface unit (Column 13, lines 42-45). This new system would be the system of Renner et al. and Vos with the malfunction detection and communication of Beigel et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to adapt the system to detect and communicate malfunctions with the access interface unit in order to alert the control panel that there has been a malfunction. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to view any malfunctions with the access interface units from the control panel, so that they can be fixed.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrew Caldwell
Andrew Caldwell